

## NOTES AND STUDIES

THE MSS AND TEXT OF THE *ORATIO CATECHETICA* OF ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA.

AMONG the *desiderata* of the student of patristic theology is a satisfactory edition of the works of St. Gregory of Nyssa. While the place of St. Gregory in the history of Christian thought has been, in an increasing degree, attracting the attention of the students of Christian doctrine, this interest has not been met with corresponding efforts to produce a really satisfactory edition of the text of the author. For the greater number of Gregory's treatises we are dependent on the Paris editions of 1615 and 1638, of the latter of which Migne's text (*P. G.* voll. xlv-xlvi) is a reprint. But the text in these editions is sadly corrupt, and contains considerable lacunae. The contemplated editions of G. H. Forbés, Burntisland<sup>1</sup>, and of Fr. Oehler, Halle, 1865, did not reach in either case beyond a single volume. To the labours of Krabinger we are indebted for editions of a few treatises<sup>2</sup>, including the *Oratio Catechetica* which is especially the subject of the present article. But Krabinger too diverted his attention to other work, and for many of the more important theological treatises we are still left at the mercy of corrupt and mutilated texts.

With regard to the *Oratio Catechetica*, indeed, we are somewhat better off. Krabinger's edition, 1838, was a valuable piece of work, and by the help of three MSS in the library at Munich he was able to fill up the lacunae which occur in the Paris editions. But his text was not based upon any extended collation of MSS or study of their history. The materials for such a study are considerable, though there are scarcely any MSS of a very early date, the earliest (except a ninth-century fragment of a few lines) dating from the tenth or eleventh century. By the generosity of the Committee of the Hort Memorial Fund the present writer has been enabled during the last two years to

<sup>1</sup> Tom. I fasc. i (1855) *Apologia in Hexaemeron*, *De Conditione Hominis* (as far as chap. xii) : fasc. ii (1861) *De Conditione Hominis* (chap. xii to end), *De Vita Moysis* (as far as chap. xlix).

<sup>2</sup> *De Anima et Resurrectione*, Leipzig, 1837 ; *Oratio Catechetica* and *Oratio Funebris in Meletium*, Munich, 1838 ; *De Precatione Orationes V*, Landshut, 184c.

make collations of the more important MSS of the treatise. He has also to express his obligations to Mr. C. H. Turner for some valuable information about the Italian MSS, and for many suggestions and criticisms. The following list comprises those MSS which have been collated or examined:—

- a* = Cod. Monac. 23, cent. xvi, Munich [Krab. A, Forbes *a*].
- b* = Cod. Monac. 84, cent. xvi, Munich [Krab. B].
- c* = Cod. Monac. 538 (olim Augustanus 77), cent. xvi, Munich [Krab. C].
- d* = Trinity Coll., Cambridge, B. 9. 1, cent. xii.
- e* = Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 1268 (Omont 294), cent. xii [Forbes *g*].
- f* = British Museum, Add. 22509, cent. x or xi.
- g* = Bodleian Library, Cod. Cromw. IX, 'saec. xiii et xii ineuntis.'
- h* = Imperial Library, Vienna, Gr. suppl. 10 (Kollarii suppl. xviii, Fabricius, ix 112), cent. xv.
- l* = British Museum, Royal 16 D. i, early xiii<sup>th</sup> century [Forbes *c*].
- m* = British Museum, Royal 16 D. xi, cent. xiv.
- n* = Vatican Library, Pii ii cod. gr. 4, cent. xi.
- p* = Library of St. Mark, Venice, cod. lxxvii (Zanetti, p. 45) 'saec. circiter xi.'
- q* = Cod. Vat. gr. 2066 (a fragment of chap. 10), cent. ix.
- r* = Cod. Coislin. cxx, olim ccix (a fragment of chap. 10), Paris, Bibl. Nat. (Montfaucon, p. 193), 'x saec. ineuntis.'

The following are MSS of the *Panoplia Dogmatica* of Euthymius Zigabenus, which quotes extensively from the *Or. Cat.*:—

- 1 = Cod. Monac. 55, cent. xvi, Munich.
- 2 = Cod. Monac. 367 (olim Augustanus 10), cent. xiii, Munich.
- 3 = Cod. Monac. 551 (olim Augustanus 55), cent. xv, Munich.
- 4 = Paris, Bibl. Nat. 1230 (Omont 171), cent. xiii.
- 5 = Paris, Bibl. Nat. 1231 (Omont 170), cent. xiii.
- 6 = Imperial Library, Vienna, 76 (Nessel), cent. xii.
- 7 = Imperial Library, Vienna, 40 (Nessel), cent. xv.

Of these MSS *a*, *b*, *c* and 1, 2, 3 of Euthymius were employed by Krabinger in his edition. The remainder have not as yet been used for the purpose of a critical edition of the text.

An examination of the text of these MSS leads to their classification into two main groups.

The first group contains *a*, *d*, *g*, *h*, *n*, *p*. The second contains *c*, *f*, *l*, *m*.

The two MSS *e* and *b* (which is closely connected with *e*) contain a mixed text, and borrow in turn certain distinctive readings found in one or the other of the two groups<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The facts which point to mixture in *e* are: (1) in a number of distinctive readings

I. 1. The first group may be again subdivided. The MSS *a*, *g*, *p* are closely associated: *a* is, in fact, apparently a direct descendant of *p*. The evidence for this is as follows [the references are to the pages and lines of Krabinger's text]:—

(i) lv 2. In the margin of *p* opposite the words *σωματικῆς* [vl for *Σοδο-μικῆς*] *παρανομίας* there is the gloss *τὰ Γόμορρα λέγει*. In *a* these last words have been incorporated into the text.

(ii) lxxvi 28. *p* has *λελου . . . μένου*. In *a* this lacuna is reproduced, and we find *λολου . . . μένου*.

There are other instances in which *a* follows *p* in reproducing obvious blunders.

Similarly *g* is closely allied to the text found in *p*. Thus in xlvi 28 the words *καὶ ἡ πλάνη θεραπευθείη* are omitted by all three MSS *a*, *g*, *p*. Other instances are the readings:—

xviii 17. *ὑποβαλὼν a g\* p*; *ἀποβαλὼν d h n*; *ἐπιβαλὼν e f g<sup>1</sup> l*.

xxi 24. *ὑποβάλαι g\* (ὑποβάλλοι a p)*; *ἀποβύλοι d (ἀποβάλλοι h n)*; *ἐπιβάλαι e f g<sup>1</sup> (ἐπιβάλλοι l)*.

xxii 23. *φέρειν a g p*; *φίρων d e f h l n*.

xlvi 23. *τῷ . . . εἰδῶλφ a g p*; *τὸ . . . εἰδῶλον d e f h n*.

l 15. *ἔλθοι νῦν καὶ γάρ a g p*; *εἰ γάρ d l<sup>1</sup> n* (om. *γάρ e*, οἱ γάρ *h*); *ἔλθοι. Νυνὶ γάρ f l\**.

lxix 13. *παιδευομένων a g\* p*; *πεπαιδευμένων d e f g<sup>1</sup> h n*.

lxix 34. *ἐφ' ἑαυτὸ a g\* p*; *ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ d e f g<sup>1</sup> h l n*; *ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ euth*.

lxxiv 24. *ἀγαθοῦ ὄντος a g\* p*; *ἀγαθοῦ ὄντως d*; *ἀγαθύναντος f*; *ἀγαθύνοντος e g<sup>1</sup> h l n*.

lxxvii 3. *οὐ γέγονας a g p*; *μὴ γέγονας d e f h l n*.

2. A second subdivision contains the two MSS *h* and *n*. With these is associated, where it is available, the text of Gregory found in the MSS of Euthymius. The text of *e*, where it borrows from this group, is closely connected with this subdivision to which *n* belongs. Thus we have a distinctive class of readings supported by the MSS *e*, *h*, *n*, and, where available, the text of Euthymius (cited as *euth*).

it agrees with *h n* (see below); (2) in at least twenty readings it agrees with *f* against the group *d g h n p*, while its system of chapters and colophons bears a general resemblance to that of *f*; (3) there are not more than two cases where the peculiar readings of *e* have any appearance of originality. These are discussed below.

The following facts show the dependence of *b* on *e*: (1) a number of omissions and blunders peculiar to these two MSS; (2) the presence of the same scholium on the word *μυρμηκία* in xxiv 35; (3) the enumeration of the chapters and the colophons in which *b* and *e* agree more closely than either agrees with *f*. On the other hand in a certain number of readings *b* sides with some representative of the group *c f l* against *e*. This shows that the scribe had access to some other sources as well.

The more important of these readings are :—

- (i) iv 17. δεικνυμένη *e h n euth.*; διαδικ. *dflp* (*gdeest*).
- (ii) xx 16. οὐ *e h n*; ᾠ *d fgl*; ὁ *p*.
- (iii) xxviii 2. παραλαμβάνεται *e h n*; καταλαμβάνεται *d fglp*.
- (iv) xlv 15. καὶ τὴν τῶν καταδίκων ἀνάρρυσιν *h n* (ἀνάρρησιν *e*); om. *al. omn.*
- (v) xlv 11. ἡγήσοιτο *e h n*; ἡγοῖτο *fg<sup>1</sup>l*; ἡγήσαιο *dg\* p*.
- (vi) lxii 25. καὶ διὰ τῶν γινόμενων θαυμάτων *e h n euth.*; τοῖς διὰ τῶν γινόμενων θαύμασι *dglp* (θαυμασίῳ *f*).
- (vii) lxxiii 6. αὐτὰ γεννώντων *e h n*; αὐτὸ γεννώντων *dp*; ἀπογεννώντων *fgl*.
- (viii) lxxiv 28. αὐτὸν οὐκ εἰς τὸ θεῖον *e n* (om. οὐκ *h*); εἰ καὶ οὐκ εἰ. τ. θ. *dglp*; εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ εἰ. τ. θ. *fl*.

Of these readings (i) (ii) (iii) are apparently corrections;

(v) is a corruption of the reading of *dg\* p*;

(vii) is an attempt to set right the reading found in *dp*, which is a corruption of the reading found in *fgl*;

(viii) is an attempt to set right a passage which is corrupt in all the MSS, and of which Krabinger has suggested a solution by reading εἰς αὐτὸ (i. e. τὸ κτιστόν) καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸ θεῖον.

(vi) is difficult. The reading of *e h n euth.* undoubtedly makes the passage run smoothly, but it is quite possible that here too the reading of *d fglp* covers some corruption, and that the reading of *e h n euth.* is an attempt to emend the text.

The only reading now left is (iv).

The Latin translation of P. Morel contains the words 'damnatorum absolutio,' from which it is clear that his text had the reading καὶ τὴν τῶν καταδίκων ἀνάρρυσιν. Krabinger, who inserts the words into his text, gives the same rendering, and thinks that the passage contains an allusion to the Origenistic denial of the eternity of punishment. But such a meaning is ill-suited to the context. Gregory is stating Satan's reasons for choosing Christ as a ransom. It was the signs of supernatural power displayed by Christ in His earthly life which appealed to the adversary. Gr. instances the circumstances of His birth, the voices from the unseen world testifying to His surpassing worth, the healing of disease, the restoration of the dead to life (τὴν . . . τῶν τεθηκότων ἐπὶ τὸν βίον ἀνάλυσιν) and (according to *e h n*) τὴν τῶν καταδίκων ἀνάρρυσιν. Then follow other instances, the fear inspired in demons, the power over the tempest, the walking on the sea, and the feeding of the multitudes. The words found in *e h n* must accordingly (if genuine) refer to some event or events before the Crucifixion. Moore (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. v, p. 493) suggests an allusion to our Lord's forgiveness of sinners. This is possible, but the words are somewhat difficult to fit into the context. On the other hand, it is difficult to account for their

insertion in the text, if spurious, while the resemblance of ἀνάλυσιν and ἀνάρρυσιν may have occasioned their omission.

With this possible exception, the readings of *e h n euth.* do not commend themselves as original. Taken as a whole they appear to be due to an attempt to emend the text. We find the same tendency in certain readings peculiar to individual MSS of this group and in the text of Euthymius. Thus in the following passages *euth.* stands alone in readings which undoubtedly remove difficulties of grammatical construction or make the sense clearer, but none the less from their isolated support are plainly not original.

(i) ix 3-4. ἀγαθότητα . . . δύναμιν . . . σοφίαν *euth.* ; ἀγαθότης . . . δύναμις . . . σοφία *al. omn.*

Here the reading of *euth.* is an attempt to set right a sentence, of which the construction is imperfect.

(ii) xxvii 17-21. γένεσιν ἀνθρωπίνην λέγω καὶ τὴν ἐκ νηπίου πρὸς τελείωσιν αὔξησιν, βρώσιν τε καὶ πόσιν, καὶ κόπον, καὶ ὕπνον, καὶ λύπην, καὶ δάκρυον, συκοφαντίαν τε καὶ δικαστήριον, καὶ σταυρόν, καὶ θάνατον, καὶ τὴν ἐν μνημείῳ θέσιν *euth.* ; γένεσις ἀνθρωπίνη (om. λέγω) καὶ ἡ . . . αὔξις, βρώσις . . . πόσις . . . κόπος . . . ὕπνος . . . λύπη . . . συκοφαντία . . . σταυρός . . . θάνατος . . . ἡ . . . θέσις *al. omn.*

Here, again, the construction is broken. The series of nouns was intended to form the subject of a verb, but instead of this Gregory starts a fresh sentence, ταῦτα γὰρ συμπαραλαμβανόμενα τῷ μυστηρίῳ ἀμβλύνει κ.τ.λ., and leaves the construction with which he has begun incomplete. The text of *euth.* is an attempt to set this right.

(iii) xxix 10. τῆς θείας φύσεως *euth.* ; om. τῆς *al. omn.*

The *θείας* is emphatic, and is therefore anarthrous, but the reviser has endeavoured to remove the apparent harshness of the phrase.

(iv) lxxi 15. ἐκείνος γενόμενος *euth.* 3 4 5 ; ἐκείνο *defghlnp euth.* 7 ; γινόμενον *efl* ; γενόμενον *dghnp euth.* 7.

Here ἐκείνος has been changed into ἐκείνος in order to make more apparent its reference to the preceding ἄρτον.

There are two passages in which the same desire to emend the text on the part of the scribe of *e* (and of *h* as well in one of the passages), has resulted in restoring what seems at first sight to be the original reading. They are as follows :—

(i) xxxiv 28. πορευόμενον *e h* ; πορευομένη *dgnp euth.* ; πορευομένης *fl*.

Here πορευόμενον seems at first sight preferable to πορευομένη, but a more careful examination of the passage and a comparison of Gr.'s language elsewhere tends to justify πορευομένη. Gr. is answering the objection that a human birth involves πάθος. He distinguishes between a right and a wrong use of the word. Properly πάθος can only be used of moral declension, not of natural processes. It is of these natural

processes that he says τὸ δ' ὅσον ἐν τῇ φύσει κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον εἶρμόν πορευομένη διεξοδικῶς θεωρεῖται, τοῦτο κυριώτερον ἔργον ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ πάθος προσαγορεύοιτο. The word διεξοδικῶς must be taken with θεωρεῖται, and the sentence finds a parallel in viii 6–8 ἀγαθὸν δὲ ὁ κόσμος καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα σοφῶς τε καὶ τεχνικῶς θεωρούμενα. The explanatory clause κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον εἶρμόν πορευομένη, attached to φύσει without the article τῇ, may also be paralleled by liii 20 οἱ ἐπισκεφθῆναι μὲν παρὰ τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ἀσθενήσασαν ἐν κακίᾳ τὴν φύσιν εὐλογον κρίνοντες, and by lxix 18 ὡς γὰρ τῷ φθοροποιῷ πρὸς τὸ ὑγιαῖνον ἀναμιχθέντι ἅπαν τὸ ἀνακραθὲν συνηχρεῖται. The text of *e* is an attempt to simplify the construction.

(ii) lxiii 20. ἐαυτοῖς *e*; αὐτοῖς *d f g h l n p*.

Here ἐαυτοῖς or αὐτοῖς might seem to be wanted, but its place in the text of *e* is certainly due to conjectural restoration. Similarly the late MS *c* reads αὐτοῖς, which is also certainly an emendation of the reading of *f l*.

3. The remaining MS of this group, *d*, presents no distinctive features that call for notice. It alternately sides with *n* and *p*, and appears to contain a mixed text, incorporating elements from both of the previous subdivisions.

II. Passing now to the MSS of the second main group we have to discuss the relations of *c, f, l, m*.

1. The text of *c, l, m* is closely related to that of the Paris editors, and exhibits the same series of lacunae which are found in the common text. These passages are seven in number, and are as follows:—

x 22. ἄλλο . . . λόγος, om. *c l\* m* edd.

xi 31. τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν ῥήματα, om. *c l\* m* edd.

xiv 34. τοῦτον . . . πεποιηκός, om. *c l\* m* edd.

xxi 28–30. καὶ τοῦτο . . . σβέννυσθαι, om. *c l\* m* edd.

xxiii 9. κατ' αἴσθησιν . . . διὰ τοῦτο, om. *c l\* m* edd.

xxviii 10. τοῦ πάσης . . . ἀπηλλαγμένου, om. *c l\* m* edd.

lv 5. οὐδὲ ἡ τῶν Ἰουδ. . . μαιφονία, om. *c l\* m* edd.<sup>1</sup>

These MSS also agree with the text of the Paris editions in a considerable number of distinctive readings, many of them obviously blunders. As *c* and *m* are only late forms of the text exhibited in *l* they may be ignored, the only interest of *m* being that, of all the MSS contained in the list previously given, it alone contains the spurious additions to the last chapter of the *Or. Cat.* found in the Paris editions, and beginning ὁ Χριστὸς βούλεται κ.τ.λ.

<sup>1</sup> The reading in xxii 15 εἰ γε . . . διεσώσατο, which is adopted by Krab., but is absent from *c f l\* m* edd., is almost certainly a gloss. The words ignore Gr.'s usual distinction between *εἰκὼν* and *ὁμοίωσις*, and appear to have been added to guard against a universalistic interpretation of the passage.

Paraphrase has largely operated in producing the distinctive readings of the text represented by *l* and the Paris editions. This accounts for changes of order, the substitution of more obvious for technical words, the smoothing down of harsh expressions, the improvement of the sense, changes of grammar, and the like. Instances are the substitution of ὑπολήψεις for προλήψεις in iv 5; of ψευδοποιόν for δευσοποιόν in xx 18; of προορατικῇ for γνωστικῇ in xxv 21; the addition of ἀνοίκειον καί before ἀπεμφαίνον in xxix 7; the substitution of ἀνθρωπίνῳ συγκρίματι for ἀνθρώπῳ in xxxvi 30; the correction of ἐπετηδέυετο into ἐπιτετήδευτο in xxxviii 23, and of ὑπολείπεται into υπολέλειπται in xxxix 17; the substitution of δυναμένοις for ἐπισταμένοις in xxxix 7; of τῷ καθαιρομένῳ for τοῦ καθαιρομένου after ὠφέλεια in xlix 33, and of δυνάμεως for κινήσεως in the phrase τῆς ζωτικῆς κινήσεως in lv 23-4. Similarly in xxxii 15 we find that *l* and the Paris editors read εὐτελεῖ ἐλύτρω, where *f* and the MSS of the other group read simply λύτρω. Gregory has been stating an objection to the Virgin-Birth. The objector asks why God condescended to such humiliation, and says that faith wavers before the thought that God, the incomprehensible and ineffable reality, τῷ λύτρω τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως καταμίγνυται. In place of the strong expression λύτρω, 'defilement,' which recalls the 'non horruisti' of the Te Deum, some scribe has substituted the comparatively feeble expression τῷ εὐτελεῖ ἐλύτρω, 'the mean covering.' The word εὐτελεῖ was probably suggested by the verb εὐτελίζεσθαι in the next line but one.

To this tendency to revision may be attributed the gloss found in lvii 12, the words καὶ καθ' εἰμαρμένην χωρεῖ ὁ λόγος, which are found in *l* and the Paris editions, being plainly an attempt to give expression to an idea suggested, though not actually expressed, in the sentence.

In one passage (lx 19) where *f* and the MSS of the other group are plainly corrupt, *l* and the Paris editions appear at first sight to have the correct reading. Gregory is speaking of the Divine power manifested in Christ's Passion and Resurrection, and dwells upon the fact that He did not continue in death, and that τὰς διὰ τοῦ σιδήρου κατὰ τοῦ σώματος γενομένας πληγὰς μηδὲν ἐμπόδιον πρὸς τὸ ἀναστῆναι ποιήσασθαι κατ' ἐξουσίαν τε φαίνεσθαι μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Here the reading ἀναστῆναι is supported by *l* and the Paris editions, *f* and the MSS of the other group reading εἶναι. The reading ἀναστῆναι must be due to conjectural restoration by the scribe, and as a conjecture it is possibly correct, but its position in such a late group gives it no documentary authority.

2. The class of readings which we have been considering represents a later recension of the text of this group, while *f* represents that text at an earlier and purer stage of its existence. Hence we find a large class of readings supported by *f**l*, which carry us back by a separate line of ancestry from that of the group *dghnp* to the original text.

We are thus brought face to face in the final resort with two groups of MSS, represented by *dghnp* on the one hand, and *fl* on the other. In estimating the relative value of these two groups we must take account of two facts. On the one hand the readings of *dghnp* not unfrequently point to the existence of corruption in the text which is their common source. Instances of this are :—

- v 14. *μίαν, θεότητος ὁμολογίαν, d e h n p euth.* ; *μίας θ. ὁμ. fl vulg.*
- xxxviii 7. *αὐτῶν πραγμάτων, d e g h n p* ; *πραγμάτων αὐτῶν, fl vulg.*
- xlii 13. *ἐαυτὴν, d e g\* h n p* ; *αὐτὴν g<sup>1</sup> (αὐτὴ f) l.*
- xlv 33. *δογμάτων, d e g h n p* ; *θαυμάτων, fl vulg.*
- xlvi 25. *ἀκροτάτω, d e g\* h n p* ; *ἀκράτῳ, f g<sup>1</sup> l vulg.*
- lxii 32. *om. ἄν d e g h n p euth.* ; *insert ἄν fl vulg.*

On the other hand the text of *fl* shows at times a tendency to paraphrase and revision. Instances of this are :—

- iv 26. *ἐννοίαν* for *ἐπίνοίαν*.
- 31. add *ἡμῖν* after *δοθέντος*.
- v 3. *καταλάβοι* for *καταλαμβάνοι*.
- 9. insert *τις* after *ὑπόληψιν*.
- ix 10. *ἀναλογικῶς* for *ἀναγωγικῶς*.
- 29. *προφερόμενον* for *προφαινόμενον*.
- x 17. *λαβεῖν* for *λαμβάνειν*.
- ibid. *διασαφῆσαι* for *διασαφείν*.
- 21. *μεμέρισται* for *διώρισται*.
- xi 17. *φιλοπονωτέροις* for *φιλοτιμοτέροις*.
- xii 27. *ὀρεκτικὴν* for *προεκτικὴν*.

Allowing for this occasional tendency, however, the text of *fl* generally gives a good, vigorous sense, and its readings are often superior to those of the other group. The effect of this conclusion is to reverse Krabinger's judgement on a number of readings, and to vindicate those of the Paris edition as represented in Migne. Krabinger's access to the group *fl* was only obtained through the late and corrupt MS *c*. He had accordingly no means of distinguishing the earlier and purer stage in its history from the later and more corrupt form. This genuine element in the text of the Paris editions we are now able to rescue with the help of the early MS *f*.

We may now summarize the results which have been attained. The primary authorities for the text of the *Oratio Catechetica* are: in Group I, *p* and *n*: in Group II, *f* and *l*. Attention should also be paid to the readings of *g<sup>1</sup>*, which frequently supports *f*. An edition of the treatise, with a revised text, embodying the above results, is in preparation.

J. H. SRAWLEY.